

INTERAGENCY ADVISORY GROUP

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

June 19, 1979

Secretariat
Room 1304—1900 E St., N.W.
Code 101, Ext. 26266 or
Area Code 202—632-6266

SUBJECT: Special Notice - Classification Chiefs Conference

FROM: Rosemary Figueroa, *R. Figueroa* Staff Director, IAG

TO: Members of the IAG Committee on Job Evaluation

The planned 1979 Classification Chiefs Conference, which is to be held at the Village Inn, Deep Creek Lake, Garrett County, Maryland has been rescheduled. It will be held from Sunday, October 21 through Wednesday, October 24, 1979 with check in PM Sunday and departure Wednesday afternoon. Previously mentioned September dates have been cancelled.

INTERAGENCY ADVISORY GROUP

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

Secretariat
Room 1304—1900 E St., N.W.
Code 101, Ext. 26266 or
Area Code 202—632-6266

Minutes of the Committee on Job Evaluation

May 22, 1979

The meeting was chaired by Morris Glazer of Standards Development Center, who acted in the absence of Paul A. Katz, Director, Standards Development Center. The principal purpose of the meeting was to discuss an agenda item, scheduled for the May 9 meeting, which had not been covered because there was insufficient time. That item concerned plans for action by the agencies/IAG Committee in response to the Williamsburg Conference.

The meeting opened with a discussion of the proposal by Leo Rickwa (Dept of Navy) that the time frame for agency review and comment on tentative drafts of classification standards be extended up to six months. Mr. Glazer reported that he had discussed the proposal with the section chiefs in Standards Development and they indicated that the response time provided varies, depending upon known or anticipated issues or other circumstances involving specific draft standards packages. The usual pattern is 60 to 90 days, with as much as 120 days sometimes provided. Extensions are granted when needed but there is also the objective to keep standards production on target. Where an extension is granted, there is an obligation for the agency to submit its comments in a timely manner.

The discussion which followed included these representative comments.

- o A longer time frame for comments, rather than extensions, may be more advisable to aid in securing quality comments.
- o Standards reviews require more time now and it is crucial that sufficient time be allowed to make quality comments possible.
- o The root problem may be that agencies do not know how to go about a review. Perhaps what is needed is a seminar on what and how to review.
- o Time, as well as training, is needed.
- o Time that is available now is sufficient; no matter what time period is allowed, there will always be some who will want more time.
- o The sheer job of distribution within the agency makes a minimum of 90 days advisable.

Mr. Glazer indicated that these comments would be considered by the Standards Development Center in attempting to resolve this issue.

Mr. Glazer introduced the discussion of the main agenda item by acknowledging that the attention of the agencies and OPM had been very much occupied by Civil Service Reform and the reorganization of OPM. While this may have had an influence on the anticipated momentum to action generated by the Williamsburg conference, nevertheless he could report some positive results within OPM. One specific outcome of the Williamsburg report recommendations was the focus of attention by a task force within Agency Compliance & Evaluation (ACE), which was appointed to study the twin issues of overgrading and poor position management. The task force findings, which in a number of instances parallel the Williamsburg recommendations, have gone into an extensive report that has been sent to the Deputy Director, OPM, Jule Sugarman. Action has not yet been taken since the report is being coordinated with affected elements in OPM.

Another outcome is the increased communication between ACE and Standards, such as that provided by the recent conference of OPM Regional Evaluation Chiefs in which issues addressed in Williamsburg were discussed. Further, specific action has been taken on the Workshop recommendation for agency participation in increased standards production. In addition to the recent standards study agreements with the Veterans Administration, Mr. Glazer mentioned the designation of a Standards Development staff group to study alternatives available in the utilization of agency personnel in standards development.

Discussion then focused on the extract of Workshop recommendations which had been furnished to the members in advance to stimulate thinking about implementation strategy (copy attached). While most of the items were considered to be important, six items were seen by the group as deserving of special priority attention. These were:

- Item #1: Guides for staffing the classification function
- #6: Adequate maintenance review policy/procedures
- #12: Assessment through PME process that comprehensive maintenance reviews/classification surveys are carried out
- #2: Classification training plans and program
- #5: Criteria for evaluation reports
- #8: Guides for technical proficiency needed by individuals to exercise delegated classification authority

After a general discussion of these items and others, the members considered options available for action on the recommendations. Roy Naquin (Dept of HEW) emphasized the need for evidence of achievement and for concentrating on those projects that were within the scope of authority of the members. For example, joint development of criteria for evaluation reports was a relatively practical action item because it could be accomplished by the members. Harvey Shaynes (Dept of Army) spoke of the need to concentrate on developing specific models, whether they be policies or programs, from among the alternatives presented in the Williamsburg conference. Such an endeavor would call for collective action by the agencies under the sponsorship of the IAG Committee. Moe Moser, Chief, Methods Development Section, Standards Development Center, proposed that a small group be designated as a steering committee whose task would be to decide appropriate steps to be taken to bring the priority items to action and achievement. With the general agreement of the IAG Committee, Standards Development Center will take the initiative to ask individual members to serve on the indicated steering committee.

Attachment

Checklist on recommendations made by the 1978 Agency Classification Chiefs Workshop

(Recommendations shown essentially are directed to agencies. Those designated for CSC/OPM action have not been included. A report concerning them will be made at the Committee meeting.)

1. Agencies, under sponsorship of IAG Job Eval Committee, should develop guides for staffing, classification function.
2. Agencies, under sponsorship of IAG Job Eval Committee, should develop a structured training plan on position classification for government-wide use. Also, compile and publish a catalog of courses offered by OPM and agencies on classification. Work with large agencies to establish training agreements across agency lines.
3. IAG should assemble information on performance requirements and make it available, together with operational guides, for use by agencies in developing their own performance standards for individual classifier positions.
4. Standards Division, together with agencies, explore ways in which agencies can assist in preparation of standards.
5. OPM, in cooperation with agencies, establish minimum criteria for preparation of evaluation reports.
6. Agencies ensure policy/procedures for an adequate maintenance review are established.
7. Agencies consider limiting redelegation of classification authority to heads of organizations having personnel staffs.
8. Agencies consider developing guidelines setting forth the minimum technical proficiency an individual must have in order to exercise delegated classification authority.
9. Agencies insure that a professional review is made of field material developed to test draft FES standards.
10. Agencies develop supplements to standards to achieve classification consistency.
11. OPM and agencies, in conducting inspections, rate high level managers on their support for sound classification and position management practices.
12. Agencies and OPM assess and assure, through the PNE process, that regular, comprehensive maintenance reviews/classification surveys are carried out by personnel offices to illuminate position management/classification status of operating units.